The Self, rising in the firmament of the heart,—sun of wisdom, darkness-dispersing, all-present, all supporting,—shines forth and illumines all. —SHANKARACHARYA

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 60 MAY, 1972 NUMBER 7

POLES OF SELF-KNOWLEDGE

OF all the labors undertaken by the great teachers of mankind, that of persuading human beings of their own potential divinity is unquestionably the most difficult to accomplish. The meaning of divinity, from the Theosophical point of view, depends for its realization on conscious recognition of the universality of the Self within, with all that this implies, and while this is understandable as a metaphysical proposition, there remains a very great difference between grasping the logic of an idea and knowing its full reality.

What, then, *is* divinity?

A passage from the thirteenth chapter of *The Bhagavad-Gita* will help to provide an answer:

> Know that *prakriti* or nature, and *purusha* the spirit, are without beginning. And know that the passions and the three qualities are sprung from nature. Nature or *prakriti* is said to be that which operates in producing cause and effect in actions; individual spirit or *purusha* is said to be the cause of experiencing pain and pleasure. For spirit when invested with matter or *prakriti* experienceth the qualities which proceed from *prakriti;* its connection with these qualities is the cause of its rebirth in good and evil wombs. The spirit in the body is called *Maheswara,* the Great Lord, the spectator, the admonisher, the sustainer, the enjoyer, and also the *Paramâtma,* the highest soul. He who thus knoweth the spirit and nature, together with the qualities, whatever mode of life he may lead, is not born again on this earth.

Here we have named the two aspects of the spirit in man—

purusha is the individual consciousness which through incarnation becomes connected with matter and its qualities, but it is also the universal spirit, the highest soul, which is the same in all and which is not reduced by any combination of form and matter. Yet only through the individual *purusha* can the Great Lord obtain consciousness on this plane.

How can the individual spirit, tied to the body by all the limitations of its vehicle, recognize its identity with the universal spirit? A human being *feels* confined; life is filled with barriers and obstacles, and many antagonisms are encountered. Where is there divinity in this?

Yet the soul, as we know, has glimpses. There are wonderful intimations, however rare, of a life freed from the oppressions of body and circumstances. Metaphysical teachings have a symmetry which appeals to the reason, while there is deep intuitive response to the exquisite utterances of great scriptures which speak to the heart. Even if the measurable realities of daily life seem in inexorable conflict with those incommensurable reaches of possibility felt by the soul, the inner longings are continually reborn, even from the ashes of disappointment and harsh misfortune. So the quest for divinity continues, although too often an impatience born of merely human longing leads to compromised and therefore temporary goals.

The truly great teacher is known by his refusal to collaborate in any of these compromises, or to allow definition of the highest reality in man in terms of some refinement of the qualities in nature.

Yet there are, one might say, "compromises" of a sort—not as a means of lowering the ideal, or making the goal seem easy of access, but in consideration of the practical limitations which belong to the age or cycle of human development. These are not compromises of principle, but those imposed by forms and vehicles. H.P.B., for example, was continually frustrated by the philosophical poverty of the English language. Her aim was clarity in respect to spiritual reality and how it may be understood, yet she was obliged to use a form of speech that had few if any precise terms for such teachings. The teacher, then, had to submit what language she employed to a kind of forced, hot-house growth, endeavoring to provide a greater discipline to her words as she went along. In the *Forum* answer given by Mr. Judge to a question about the "Rootless Root," reprinted in this Magazine in February, the problem

confronting the author of *The Secret Doctrine* becomes quite evident. Yet no reader of that astonishing work can fail to admit that H.P.B.'s command of English is extraordinary, bringing great power when it is wanted, and rare subtlety and delicacy as well.

"Whatever the path chosen by mankind, that path is mine," could have been declared with justice by H.P.B. As Judge says in "The Synthesis of Occult Science," she addressed the thought of her age, recognizing its shortcomings, and endeavoring to lift its level to a higher plane of awareness, not by leaving the men of that age behind, but by enlarging the forms of their thought, by pointing to how it might develop under the impetus of a new vision brought forth from a timeless source.

What was the intent in all this? Her purpose, put most simply, was to stir her readers to a fresh awareness of the divine possibilities in every human being. She was able to put archaic philosophical verities into the idiom of modern times, not by reduction of old wisdom to inadequate containers, but by forging a speech of philosophical communication that had the living truth in it. It is often said that she drew heavily on the philosophies of the ancient East, and this is true enough, but the teachings of H.P.B. are no "importation." They are the vital expression of a human intelligence so cosmopolitan that no geographical designation can serve to identify it, no cultural past define its limits. The Wisdom-Religion was *reborn* by H.P.B., not merely translated or retold. Something similar could be said of the work of Mr. Judge, since there is a native, indigenous quality in everything he wrote.

Becoming aware of divine possibilities means finding realities at levels of being which we hardly supposed existed, save, perhaps, in poetic fancy. What is abstract to physical perception, H.P.B. would say, may have substantial reality to the mind, and dimensions tangible to the eye of soul. These faculties of perception must finally awaken and be honored as the means of true vision, for human beings, if the nature of man is to be realized in all its potentialities. Yet here precocious "occult powers" are not necessarily indicated, nor even some lowly form of clairvoyance. There is another dimension of divinity too often left out of account in considering the possibilities of future human evolution. Altruism is a manifest of potential divinity. Seeing others as a part of oneself, regardless of superficial differences, renders the abstract into concrete reality. Altruism bespeaks an awareness of the common self which does not

wait on intellectual or trans-physical confirmation. Love of one's fellows is a form of knowing, and seeking to understand them, as differentiated expressions of the one, great, hidden Reality and Universal Self, showing forth the endless diversity of all Its excellences—this is an aspect of science, a kind of cognition which may give indispensable first principles or starting-points to reason.

Every gain has its price or cost in the world of matter, but what such laws rule the world of spiritual growth? Could a man bargain with his unselfishness, as though it were a store of precious things having some sort of exchange value? Only beings forgetful of their divine origin could think of spiritual progress along such lines, for it is neither a flight from punishment, the completion of a contract, nor the winning of a reward, even though all these modes of calculation might in afterthought be applied. Spiritual progress comes from the fire that springs in a man's breast, urging him on to the promethean mission he undertook so long ago. He cannot *feel* the meaning of divinity without forgetting himself, and in forgetting himself he discovers himself—a paradox, truly.

How could this be put into words? Yet it has been put into words —all of it that words will hold—by H.P.B.

What, then, is divinity? Divinity fully realized belongs to those who reach that high estate of knowledge spoken of at the end of the quotation from *The Bhagavad-Gita*—those who know both the spirit and nature—who need not be reborn, yet *are* reborn, because they elect to become teachers of mankind. They know all the devices of the three qualities, and every form of pleasure and pain; they know the traps and snares to which men are heir, and they know from personal experience how difficult it is to gain independence from all these illusions. But they also know that it can be done, that it is worth doing, and that the salvation of the human race can be achieved in no other way. This is what and why they teach.

The INFINITE cannot be known to our reason, which can only distinguish and define;—but we can always conceive the abstract idea thereof, thanks to that faculty higher than our reason,— *intuition,* or the spiritual instinct of which I have spoken.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

From The Theosophical Forum

V

On page 175, Vol. I of The Secret Doctrine *there are the words ". . . from the mineral monad up to the time when that monad blossoms forth by evolution into the divine monad," while on page 178 it is said that "it would be very misleading to imagine a monad as a separate entity trailing its slow way in a distinct path through the lower kingdoms, and, after an incalculable series of transformations, flowering into a human being." These passages seem a flat contradiction.*

W.Q.J.—The passages quoted are not a contradiction. In reading this book, just as in reading any serious book, all the passages must be taken together and construed together and not separately. Now H.P.B. definitely explains that in using the terms "mineral monad, vegetable monad, animal monad," and so on, the same monad is always meant, the qualifying word simply designating the particular kingdom in which the monad is at work. And if you will reflect a moment, the word "monad" precludes any other construction—since monad means one. The very quotation at page 178 which you give agrees with what I say, because she is there stating that it would be misleading to suppose that a monad is a separate entity which makes its way through the lower kingdoms and then instantly becomes a human being. No such thing as this is a fact, nor is it stated, although if you read these pages hurriedly or carelessly you may think that the statement is made. For when the monad reaches the human stage it is the same monad which was once in the mineral stage, meaning that the monad is necessary to each kingdom, and what we call the human monad is simply the unchangeable monad now functioning in bodies called human which are of a higher capacity for experience and cognition than the bodies of the lower kingdoms. A mineral is as much a body as a human body is. And as Dr. Arch. Keightley says today, the second passage you quote explains the first, and in many parts of *The Secret Doctrine* it is shown that the monad manifested in any department of nature has to be designated by some name which indicates the particular kingdom in which it is manifesting; but this does not alter its character.

All men are "men," but we are in the habit of saying "Englishmen," "Chinamen," "Fiji men," "African men." Are these all human beings or are they not? The particular qualifying title given to each simply designates the variety of man, and the particular qualifying title to the monad simply designates the particular department of nature in which the monad is incarnating and at work. I think these will show you the necessity for very careful reading and thinking while you read on subjects such as these since they are new to our thought.

Is it possible that our lower nature is composed of groups of elementary beings (sub-human) which under the higher tutelage can be welded into a force for good, rather than a something evil that has to be cast off? If so, ought not the Higher Ego to be considered a trainer and teacher of the Lower Manas rather than as a foe, even as a parent restrains his children from wrong-doing, and would not this view make the conflict between the animal and spiritual nature easier to most people?

W.Q.J.— . . . The lower nature cannot be cast off, but must be subjugated. We might as well say we can annihilate universal mind as to say we can "cast off" anything that is a part of nature and going to make us what we are. The lower nature must be discovered in all its ramifications and carefully subdued, as thus it is transformed and not cast off. [The] "sub-human elementals" composing us . . . are not fanciful. . . . If there is any point strongly made in occultism it is that we are a compound of lives, that every part of us is so made, and hence it follows that our lower nature is made of these lives. There is no vacuum in the universe void of a life. But while this is so, these lives, in so far as they go to make up man, are not to be considered as separate beings from himself whom he can "educate," as inferred in the question, from a position as man which is apart from them. They exist in him, and as he lives and thinks so he impresses on them his thoughts and acts, and as they are leaving him every moment of time it follows that a stream of these lives of many grades and sorts is continually being projected from him into space and forming his own karma. For they are unintelligent and only act in their own way, just as water acts when it runs down hill. If we regard them as beings that we are educating we will fall into superstition, but if, on the other hand, we say they do not exist and have no place in us, . . . we will never come to right knowledge of the universe as it is.

They are matter, in fact, and a certain quantity of it comes into the charge, so to say, of every man, and every one is therefore responsible for the impressions he gives to the atoms that make him up, and if he does not live aright he will have to suffer the consequences sooner or later. For these very elementals are the means whereby karma operates, for without them—considering atoms as points of sensitiveness—there would be a break and no way for karma to have effect. If they do not exist, then there is no way to make the connection between matter and mind and thought and circumstance.

The conflict between the higher and the lower can be made easy only by the old rule "to look on all parts of the universe as containing spiritual beings, the same in kind and only differing from each other in degree."

In The Secret Doctrine, *Vol. I, among the remarks upon sentiency of matter and force, I find this statement—"This consciousness has no relation to our consciousness." Now as all knowledge is the result of comparison, and our "consciousness" being at one and the same time the cause and instrument of knowledge, as acts, the process of obtainment and knowledge itself, why does* The Secret Doctrine *make affirmations, the data of thought or knowledge being absent?*

W.Q.J.—The statement made by H.P.B. as above is a copy of that made by her teachers called "Masters" by her. These are supposed to know the facts they give. Whether the claim be true or not, it is evident that insects have a consciousness which is different from ours, as we seem to add the element which makes ours "self-consciousness." And when H.P.B. spoke of our consciousness it is very plain she meant the ordinary sort and not the extraordinary. If the questioner will reflect that she has no comprehension of the consciousness of elemental spirits—which yet do actually exist and function in their own sphere—she may see that there may be varieties of consciousness not ours as yet.

How is one to learn the nature of and how to practice the specific course of training, physical, intellectual, and spiritual, spoken of in the "Epitome of Theosophy"?

W.Q.J.—The specific course of training spoken of in the tract referred to in the question is found in many Hindu, European, and other writings. It was practiced in part by the Christian mystics just as much as by others, but it is specially given and explained

in Patanjali's *Yoga Philosophy*. If one follows all the directions of that book he will reach the highest result of spiritual cultivation, but the difficulty is that many Theosophists, after reading that book, attempt to practice portions of it without attending to the high moral precept therein, and naturally they create disturbance within themselves without any very beneficial result.

THE MAKING OF A WORLD

Truth has a value of its own, and the greatest determinant of attention is just the scale of values which human judgment has set up for itself. It is this scale of values that determines our interest, and our interest dominates our attention. . . . It is the characteristic quality of highly-evolved, conscious, moral, spiritual life to transform the given world into a world which will correspond with its highest ideal, and be the image of its deepest thought. . . . In whatever direction we look, we find that it is the scale of values that determines the interest of man, and sets him to work for its realization. Values—artistic, scientific, ethical, spiritual—are the dominating interest of conscious life, and these are the ends which all men seek to realize.

For the conscious spirit, then, the given world is plastic, something to be formed into a world of specific value in which it may find its appropriate home. The machinery of the world, its laws, whether mental or material, may submit to new directions, take on new meanings, and issue in results not to be accounted for apart from the activity of the conscious spirit. Material laws may find a new expression in the *Principia* of Newton, which, after all, is as much poetry as science. It is nature as transformed in the mind of Newton. The philosophy of Hegel, *e.g.*, or of other great masters in philosophy, is a revelation of personality, as much as, or even more than, it is a transcript of the meaning of reality. For each mind in the world has to make a world for itself, and it will be the centre of its own world. How each world so made corresponds to the world which is common to all, how the general is related to the individual world, is another question. What concern us here is that the phenomenon which we call voluntary attention is the chief means by which the world of values is made; and without its working no world is possible for man.

—JAMES IVERACH

THE LIVING GUARDIANS

TRUTH is stranger than fiction, and this world-old adage finds its application in the case in hand. The wisdom of the archaic ages or the "Secret Doctrine" embodied in the Oriental Kabala—of which the Rabbinical is but an abridgement—did not die out with the last eclectic school. The Gnosis lingers still on earth and its votaries are many, albeit unknown. Secret brotherhoods have been mentioned by more than one great author. If they have been regarded as mere fictions of the novelist, that fact has only helped the "brother-adepts" to keep their incognito the more easily. Throughout the interminable ages we find now and then men who more or less succeed in uniting themselves "with God," as the expression goes—with their own *spirit,* as we ought to translate. The Buddhists call such men Arhats: they in whom evil desire is entirely destroyed.

From the very day when the first mystic found the means of communication between this world and the worlds of the invisible hosts, between the sphere of matter and that of pure spirit, he concluded that to abandon this mysterious science to the profanation of the rabble was to lose it. An abuse of it might lead mankind to speedy destruction; it was like surrounding a group of children with explosives and furnishing them with matches. The first self-made adept initiated but a select few, and kept silence with the multitudes. He recognized his God and felt the great Being within himself. The Atman, the Self, the mighty Lord and Protector, once that man knew him as the "I am," the Ego Sum, showed his full powers to him who could recognize the "still small voice." From the days of the primitive man described by the first Vedic poet, down to our modern age, there has not been a philosopher worthy of the name who did not carry in the silent sanctuary of his heart the grand and mysterious truth. If initiated, he learned it as a sacred science. If otherwise, then like Socrates repeating to himself, as well as to his fellowmen, the noble injunction "O man, know thyself," he succeeded in recognizing his God within himself.

NOTE.—Collated from standard Theosophical writings. Reprinted from THEOSOPHY for June, 1960.

Things "unseen and incorporeal," the mystery of Being outside our terrestrial sphere, Buddha left entirely untouched in his public lectures, reserving the hidden truths for a select circle of his Arhats. This latter was the name first given to the Jain and subsequently to the Buddhist holy men initiated into the esoteric mysteries. The Arhat is one who has entered the best and highest path, and is thus emancipated from rebirth. At his death he is never reincarnated but invariably attains Nirvana, the world of *cause*, in which all deceptive effects or delusions of our senses disappear. It means the certitude of personal immortality in Spirit, not in Soul—which as a finite emanation must certainly disintegrate its particles, a compound of human sensations, passions, and yearning for some objective kind of existence; before the immortal spirit of the *Ego* is quite freed and henceforth secure against further transmigration in any form. And how can man ever reach this state so long as the *Upadana,* that state of longing for life, does not disappear from the sentient being, from the Ahankara clothed, however, in a sublimated body? It is the *Upadana* or the intense desire which produces WILL, and it is *will* which develops force, and the latter generates matter or an objective form. Thus the disembodied Ego, through this sole undying desire in him, unconsciously furnishes the conditions of his successive self-procreation in various forms, which depend on his mental state and karma, the good or bad deeds of his preceding existence commonly called merit and demerit.

This is why the Master recommended to his mendicants the cultivation of the four degrees of Dhyana, the noble "Path of the Four Truths," i.e., that gradual acquirement of stoical indifference for either life or death. That state of spiritual self-contemplation during which man utterly loses sight of his physical and dual individuality, composed of soul and body; and, uniting himself with his third and higher immortal Self, the real and heavenly man merges, so to say, into the divine Essence, whence his own spirit proceeded like a spark from the common hearth. Thus the Arhat, the holy mendicant, can reach Nirvana while yet on earth; and his spirit, totally freed from the trammels of the "psychical, terrestrial, *devilish* wisdom," as James calls it, and being in its own nature omniscient and omnipotent, can on earth through the sole power of his *thought* (Kriyashakti) produce the greatest of phenomena.

There are four grades of initiation mentioned in exoteric works, which are known respectively in Sanskrit as Scrotapanna, Sagar-

dagan, Anagamin, and Arhan—the four paths to Nirvana in this, our fourth Round, bearing the same appellations. The "Arhan," though he can see the past, the present and the future, is not yet the highest initiate, for the Adept himself, the initiated candidate, becomes chela (pupil) to a higher Initiate. Three further grades have to be conquered by the Arhan who would reach the apex of the ladder of Arhatship. There are those who have reached it even in this fifth race of ours, but the faculties necessary for the attainment of these higher grades will be fully developed in the average ascetic only at the end of this root-race, and in the Sixth and Seventh. Thus there will always be initiates and the profane till the end of this minor Manvantara, the present life-cycle.

Said Buddha: "No Arhat, oh mendicant, can reach absolute knowledge before he becomes one with Paranirvana. Parakalpita and Paratantra are his two great enemies." Parakalpita is error, made by those unable to realize the emptiness and illusionary nature of all; who believe something to exist which does not—e.g., the Non-Ego. Paratantra is that, whatever it is, which exists only through a dependent or causal connection, and which has to disappear as soon as the cause from which it proceeds is removed—e.g., the light of a wick. Destroy or extinguish it, and light disappears. One feels a serious doubt whether, with all its intellectual acuteness, our age is destined to discover in each Western nation even one solitary, uninitiated scholar or philosopher capable of fully comprehending the spirit of archaic philosophy. Nor can one be expected to, before the real meaning of these terms, the *alpha* and *omega* of our Eastern esotericism, the words *Sat* and *Asat*—so freely used in the Rig-Veda and elsewhere—is thoroughly assimilated. Without this key to the Aryan wisdom, the cosmogony of the Rishis and the Arhats is in danger of remaining a dead letter to the average orientalist. *Asat* is not merely the negation of *Sat*, nor is it the "not yet existing"; for Sat is in itself neither the "Existent" or "being." SAT is immutable, the ever present, changeless and eternal root, from and through which all proceeds. But it is far more than the potential force in the seed which propels onward the process of development, or what is now called evolution. It is the ever-becoming, though the never-manifesting. *Sat* is born from *Asat*, and *Asat* is begotten by *Sat*: the perpetual motion in a circle, truly; yet a circle that can be squared only at the supreme Initiation, at the threshold of Paranirvana.

Dangma, in Tibetan, means a purified soul, one who has become the highest adept or rather a Mahatma, so called. The "opened eye" of the Dangma is the inner spiritual eye of the seer, and the faculty which manifests through it is not clairvoyance as ordinarily understood, i.e., the power of seeing at a distance. It is rather the faculty of spiritual intuition, *through which direct and certain knowledge is obtainable.* This faculty is intimately connected with the "third eye," which mythological tradition ascribes to certain races of men. Thus, e.g., by their spiritual sight the adepts, and even some sensitives and seers, are always able to discern, in a greater or smaller degree, the presence and close proximity to us of Beings pertaining to other spheres of life. Those of the (spiritually) higher worlds, communicate only with those terrestrial mortals—the adepts—who ascend to them, through individual efforts, on to the higher plane they are occupying. Such great adept astronomers were the scientists of the earliest races of the Aryan stock, that they seem to have known far more about the races of Mars, and Venus even, than the modern anthropologist knows of those of the early stages of the earth. The adept may read the future in an elemental monad, but he has to draw for his object a great number of them, as each monad represents only a portion of the kingdom it belongs to. There is a transcendental set of causes put in motion—so to speak—in the occurrence of these phenomena, which, not being in relation to our narrow range of cognition, can only be traced to their source and their nature, and understood by the spiritual faculties of the adept. It is taught that there is an inherent law—not only in the primordial, but also in the manifested matter on our phenomenal plane—by which Nature correlates her geometrical forms, and later also her compound elements; and in which there is no place for accident or chance. It is a fundamental law in occultism that there is no rest or cessation of motion in Nature. It is the knowledge of this law that permits and helps the Arhat to perform his *Siddhis,* or various phenomena, such as disintegration of matter, the transport of objects from one plane to another.

The earliest initiates and adepts, or the "Wise Men," for whom it is claimed that they were initiated into the mysteries of Nature by the Universal Mind, represented by the highest angels (Dhyanis), were named the "Serpents of Wisdom" and "Dragons." In the Yogacharya system of the contemplative Mahayana school, *Alaya* is both the Universal Soul (Anima Mundi) and the Self of a pro-

gressed Adept. "He who is strong in the Yoga can introduce at will his Alaya by means of meditation into the true nature of existence." *The Secret Doctrine* teaches that man—man in the future of his evolutionary journey—will pass through strange transformations. Even the "War in Heaven" of every scripture is shown, in one of its significations, to have meant and referred to those terrible struggles in store for the candidate for adeptship, between himself and his (by magic) personified human passions, when the *inner* enlightened man had either to slay them or fail. In the former case he became the "Dragon-Slayer," as having happily overcome all the temptations; and a "Son of the Serpent" and a Serpent himself, having cast off his old skin and been born in a *new* body, thus becoming a Son of Wisdom and Immortality in Eternity. In the symbology of cosmogony, it is taught that in the course of time the seven-headed or septenary Dragon-Logos was split up, so to speak, into four heptanomic parts or twenty eight portions. Each lunar week has a distinct occult character in the lunar months; each day of the twenty-eight has its special characteristics; as each of the twelve constellations, whether separate or in combination with other signs, has an occult influence either for good or for evil. This represents the sum of knowledge that man can acquire on this earth. Yet few are those who acquire it, and still fewer are the wise men who get to the root of knowledge symbolized by the great Root Dragon, the spiritual Logos of these visible signs. But those who do, receive the name of "Dragons," and they are the "Arhats of the Four Truths of the 28 Faculties," or attributes, and have always been so called.

An adept must refuse to impart the conditions and means which lead to the correlation of the elements, whether psychic or physical, that may produce a hurtful result as well as a beneficent one. But he is ever ready to impart to the earnest student the secret of the ancient thought in anything that regards history concealed under mythological symbolism, and thus to furnish a few more landmarks toward a retrospective view of the past, as containing useful information with regard to the origin of man, the evolution of the races and geognosy.

But why do not the adepts reveal all that they know? To this one might answer: "Why should they, since one knows beforehand that no man of science will accept, even as an hypothesis, let alone as a theory or axiom, the facts imparted. Have they so much as accepted or believed in the A B C of the Occult philosophy contained in the theosophical works and periodicals? Has not even the little which

was given, been ridiculed and derided? . . ." Notwithstanding such an unenviable prospect, a mass of facts is given in the present work —*The Secret Doctrine*. Yet, many are the candidates at the doors of those who are supposed to know the path that leads to the secret brotherhoods. The great majority are refused admittance; and these turn away, interpreting the refusal as an evidence of the non-existence of any such secret society. Of the minority accepted, more than two-thirds fail upon trial. The seventh rule of the ancient Rosicrucian brotherhoods, which is universal among all true secret societies: "the Rosy-Crux becomes and is not *made*," is more than the generality of men can bear to have applied to them. But let no one suppose that of the candidates who fail, any will divulge to the world even the trifle they may have learned, as some Masons do. None know better than themselves how unlikely it is that a neophyte should ever talk of what was imparted to him. Thus these societies will go on and hear themselves denied without uttering a word—until the day shall come for them to throw off their reserve and show how completely they are masters of the situation!

In what age were there no Occultists and no Adepts? Travelers have met them on the shores of the sacred Ganges, brushed against them in the silent ruins of Thebes, and in the mysterious departed chambers of Luxor. They have been encountered in the caves of Elephanta and on the arid desolate plains of the Great Sahara. Historical memoirs have recorded their presence in brilliantly illuminated salons of European aristocracy. They may be found everywhere, but make themselves known only to those who have devoted their lives to unselfish study and are not likely to turn back. Also, there are numbers of these mystic brotherhoods which have naught to do with "civilized" countries and it is in their unknown communities that are concealed the skeletons of the past. These adepts could, if they chose, lay claim to strange ancestry, and exhibit verifiable documents that would explain many a mysterious page in both sacred and profane history. Had the keys to the hieratic writings and the secret of Egyptian and Hindu symbolism been known to the Christian Fathers, they would not have allowed a single monument of old to stand unmutilated. And yet, if we are well informed—and we think we are—there was no one such in all Egypt, but that the secret records of its hieroglyphics were carefully registered by the sacerdotal caste. These records still exist, though "not extant" for the general public, though perhaps the monuments may have passed

away forever out of human sight.

H. P. Blavatsky states that the adepts have each their Dhyani-Buddha, their elder "twin Soul," and they *know* it—calling it "Father-Soul" and "Father-Fire." It is only at the last and supreme initiation, however, that they learn it when placed face to face with the bright "Image." Elsewhere she states that there were those among the highest *epoptæ* (initiated) of the greater *Mysteries* (of Greece, and all other countries) who knew nothing of their last and dreaded rite—the voluntary transfer of life from hierophant to candidate. Once that an adept was initiated into the last and most solemn mystery of the life-transfer, the awful seventh rite of the great sacerdotal operation, which is the highest theurgy, he belonged no more to this world. His soul was free thereafter, and the seven mortal sins lying in wait to devour his heart—as the soul, liberated by death, would be crossing the seven halls and seven staircases—could hurt him no more, alive or dead. He had passed the "twice seven trials" and twelve labors of the final hour.

It is under the direct, silent guidance of the Maha-Guru that all the other less divine Teachers and instructors of mankind became, from the first awakening of human consciousness, the guides of early Humanity.

The Source of Religions

Unity of everything in the universe implies and justifies our belief in the experience of a knowledge at once scientific, philosophical and religious, showing the necessity and actuality of the connection of man and all things in the universe with each other; which knowledge, therefore, becomes essentially RELIGION, and must be called in its integrity and universality by the distinctive name of WISDOM-RELIGION.

It is from this WISDOM-RELIGION that all the various individual "Religions" (erroneously so-called) have sprung, forming in their turn offshoots and branches, and also all the minor creeds, based upon and always originated through some personal experience in psychology. Every such religion, or religious offshoot, be it considered orthodox or heretical, wise or foolish, started originally as a clear and unadulterated stream from the Mother-Source. The fact that each became in time polluted with purely human speculations and even inventions, due to interested motives, does not prevent any from having been pure in its early beginnings.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

THE KARMA OF THOUGHT

WHEN heavy karma overtakes the individual, all his strength may be needed to weather the storm. Then, calm having been restored, he may well say to himself, This is part of life—this is the experience of all beings. But occasionally the cry is heard, What have I done to deserve all this? In part the cry reveals a feeling of responsibility which may lead to self-examination and search for a cause. Success in such self-questioning depends on the ability to concentrate upon a given characteristic or subject, and to consider its potential for good or evil.

An attempt must also be made to understand the ramifying effect of thought in relation to both the outer and the inner man. And there are other elements of self-knowledge pertaining to uncontrolled action of the mind.

It will be found that thought often flows for long periods without direction. If we could recall a substantial portion of the uncontrolled thought in its passage through the brain during an average day, we would soon be convinced that little of its flow touches the higher egoic life. What then is the Karma of undirected thought? If this thought is typically sensuous in nature, it would follow that a block is eventually formed, obstructing the ability to focus on the true purposes of the ego. This condition can be remedied only by an act of the will, producing sustained awareness of the mind's action.

The egoic or higher mind is fed by that which leads to spiritual knowledge. It is well to recall that "many who were free from craving, fear, and anger, filled with my spirit, and who depended upon me, having been purified by the ascetic fire of knowledge, have entered into my being." So speaks Krishna to Arjuna in the fourth chapter of *The Bhagavad-Gita,* in which various fires dominate. It should be of value to consider the nature of this ascetic fire.

At this point, however, we must look beyond the physical plane in order to become more familiar with the functioning of both the higher and the lower natures. There is naught in scientific thinking relative to our subject, for science has never dealt with moral issues. Turning to religion, we find that the doctrine of original sin, though given less emphasis in our age, long ago banished the thought of

potential perfection for man, in spite of Jesus' words, "Be ye therefore perfect as your Father in Heaven is perfect."

Jesus, we may recall, placed the Kingdom of God within us, and it seems evident that the "Kingdom," in this unheeded teaching, stands for the Higher Self, the Atma, the highest principle in man. But whatever the belief or philosophy by which the individual is guided, the approach to perfection is through spiritually oriented thought. And whatever the means taken to weaken and harm the soul, it is again done through thought, in this case thought animated by the lowest motivation. Thought shapes the idea; it builds the images for the imagination, the "King Faculty," and it alone can give wings to the soul, or hold it earth-bound. Thought, then, is the power by which the mind may range from spiritual aspiration to kamic desire.

The seven fires of the Secret Doctrine, each with its seven aspects, present a key to understanding of the potential forces and powers of the inner man. And, those who cultivate harmlessness and the spirit of service may find opening before them, little by little, correspondences to similar forces in Great Nature. Unfortunately, this attitude is all too rare. For several centuries science has disregarded and even encouraged suppression of the higher powers in man, and has meanwhile grown active in abusing natural resources. This science which has attained such spectacular success on the material plane has been nurtured and supported chiefly by the white race. The occult forces inherent in man and Great Nature have been ignored or vigorously denied, to give play to all that relates to the advance of material success. The industrial revolution of the nineteenth century, the lusty child of science, so potent in creating the wealth of nations, has since held the masses to the narrow limits of a visionless political economy on the one hand, and miserable poverty on the other. Thus came into play a vicious cycle creating great wealth for individuals and corporations while the masses remained insecure. The system felt its first karmic shock in the great depression of the thirties, and was later burdened by the incessant wars that followed, accompanied by the creation of ever more formidable weapons.

We now find races and nations in the throes of a psychological revolution tending toward the abandonment of all orthodoxies, in science as well as religion. At the same time crime, the world over, is reaching unbelievable proportions. Behold, then, a twofold karma beginning to reveal itself—on the one hand a release from the

weakening controls of materialistic assumption, on the other a breakdown in moral restraint.

But to return to the ascetic fire of knowledge: asceticism is defined as the means by which harmony with the divine will may be attained. To reach this exalted state the ascetic must renounce all that relates to the lower nature and remain "constantly employed in devotion to meditation upon the Supreme Spirit." This is a mode of life by which the individual may, through many lives, eventually become karmaless. Thus, to the Theosophist, the ascetic fire of knowledge alone can burn away the sterile thinking of our era, even as the present tide of materialistic thinking runs its course to exhaustion. And then the seeds of a new age, already sown by representatives of the Theosophical movement, will have opportunity to germinate and spread their beneficence far and wide.

> Until then the only palliative to the evils of life is union and harmony—a Brotherhood IN ACTU, and *altruism* not simply in name. The suppression of one single bad *cause* will suppress not one but a variety of bad effects. And if Brotherhood or even a number of Brotherhoods may not be able to prevent nations from occasionally cutting each other's throats—still unity in thought and action, and philosophical research into the mysteries of being, will always prevent some, while trying to comprehend that which has hitherto remained a riddle, from creating additional causes in a world already so full of woe and evil.

THE HIGHEST USEFULNESS

When we get the right attitude of mind—and that is what discipleship is—there is not a quality in us, not a force, not an attribute, but can be put to the best and highest use. We do not get off this plane. We do not cut off any part of our being. We do not destroy the usefulness of any part of us, but put all to the proper use and for the proper end. Herein is seen the difference between one who knows and one who does not know. One who knows does not get off to the Christian's heaven, nor to any other heaven. He works right here where he finds himself and does the best work he can with the instrument he now has, fearing nothing, trusting the Law of his own being. If any being will trust the Law of his own nature, if he will work on with nature by helping all others in every direction possible, then all nature will turn and help him. It never was otherwise. It cannot be otherwise.

—ROBERT CROSBIE

letters · questions · comment

If you don't like the circumstances you are in, is it wrong to want to change them?

Of course not, although changes accomplished from either likes or dislikes may bring no basic alteration in circumstances. But the sort of change that is brought about will be determined by "internal" as well as "external" circumstances. A large ocean wave, for example, is a neutral force in itself. To a man standing on the beach, its force and swiftness may menace or invite, depending on many factors; but the *kind of experience* it will provide is within the power of the man to determine. If he is afraid because he cannot swim, the wave presents a very real threat. If, on the other hand, he is a competent swimmer, or even has confidence in his ability to learn, he may see the wave's force as an opportunity to test his skill. Someone else in the water who is in distress, or others on the shore watching, might complicate the situation further, but only internally, for the man; the external circumstances remain the same. If we add the fact that, in a universe governed by Karma, the external circumstances may be regarded as but our own internal conditions, finally precipitated "out there," the problem may then be seen as what to do *with* the conditions, not *against* them. In the situation described, the wave may only impress the man with the desirability of learning how to swim. Or if there is an immediate need, he may try to find someone who can; he may even decide to plunge in and do the best he can. But once we take the position of studying the circumstances to see what our relation to them really is, what strengths and weaknesses of our own are involved, what is needed, what alternatives there are, whatever changes we decide to make will not be a means of escape or "running away."

We also need to examine our feelings to see if we want to rearrange things because easier conditions would ease the personal life without further effort on our part. Or perhaps an injustice is perceived, and this realization, while consistent with a true estimate of the conditions, must then go beyond emotional reaction to a rational understanding of all factors concerned before really effective action becomes possible.

Conditions are not to be "put up with"; at least, this is not by itself a constructive attitude of mind. Cessation of action is not for Deva Egos. To learn, the person must act, must choose what acts seem best. But to aim simply at changing conditions without the internal growth brought by self-examination would only re-create the old conditions again, and renew the old relationship to them.

Is there any sense in which Theosophy could be considered a religion?

In the sense that it becomes the standard by which one lives, it could be considered religion. However, the word has come to have other connotations which need inspection. The human tendency to reduce morality from being the ever-present necessity to exercise choice, to reliance on certain established practices, is a universal failing. Religions and partisan groups often represent collective crystallizations of this sort. But this tendency is not encouraged by the teachings of Theosophy, however prone individuals may be to fall into such habits.

Theosophical teachings make certain definite statements for the consideration of the student. Among them are the propositions that man's identity as a spiritual being is a reality rooted in a principle which is "Omnipresent, Eternal, Boundless, and Immutable"; and that the universe, in its totality, is governed by Law, so that there is no way for man to evade responsibility for his actions, nor any need to do so, since it is by this means that he may recover his birthright as a "god" through countless ages. How these principles are interpreted in action depends of necessity on the individual, since he alone can determine what is right for him to do at any given moment.

At the very beginning of *The Key to Theosophy,* H. P. Blavatsky explains that the book contains "the broad outlines of the Wisdom Religion"; later, in the text (p. 58), she says that Theosophy is not *a* religion, "since it is the essence of all religion and of absolute truth, a drop of which only underlies every creed." Yet a little earlier she has said that a group of people devoted to Theosophy can be regarded as its embodiment "only in its abstract motives," since it would be presumption to claim to be a concrete vehicle of such high and universal truth "so long as human imperfections and weaknesses are all represented in its body." It would be well for this questioner to give some attention to what is said on this subject in

the *Key,* since the conception involves some subtlety and ought not to be settled too easily. It would also be useful to read Madame Blavatsky's article "Is Theosophy a Religion?" which could be taken as a direct answer to the question, by the one who was the principle source of the Theosophical philosophy in the nineteenth century.

Customs of dress, speech, and behavior are continually changing. But it seems almost as easy for people to adopt new ideas without really changing themselves. Why is this?

The acceptance of new ideas is by no means a simple matter. That which is wholly a response to outside stimuli—ideas which appeal because they have become "popular" and feed that part of the mind which is most comfortable when coasting in company with others—will seem relatively easy to adopt. Such changes are not wholly without merit, however. They often pave the way for a greater flexibility and independence of mind providing at least the opportunity for deeper thought.

People often accept an idea believing that they have thereby broadened their outlook toward life, when actually they have not really changed anything, but are only interpreting a new idea in terms of old biases. But conscious effort to comprehend meaning and purpose in a way which makes us more aware of our common bond with other men, whatever the differences of experience, is not easy and must bring about much more fundamental changes in a person. It must be, too, that far-reaching changes are a combination of individual effort and association with those of non-partisan intentions and good-will. From the point of view of reincarnation it is hard to say which ideas are really "new," and which seem to us natural and welcome because they are "reincarnating" along with the egos who evolved them in some time long past.

The implications of this question are really endless. The present, in the Theosophical view, as in the thought of many observers, is a time of great transition. It is a time when, as William Q. Judge remarks in *The Ocean of Theosophy,* "the race mind is changing by enlargement," when there are many psychological developments of a strange character, when old institutions are losing their authority and people are asking questions for which they find no ready answers. Some of these tendencies are manifest in the literature of the times; others show in conflicts and struggles of various sorts

between nations and races.

Human beings make various responses to the impulse toward change. The sort of changes which are noticed in the daily newspapers and which are evident in dress and other extremes are almost certainly the most superficial effects of inner disturbance and movement. A declaration of "independence" by a child may appear as almost a tantrum, or some simple stubbornness, since the child is limited in his powers and finds a familiar channel for the outlet of his feelings, which may not be representative of their inner meaning. So with the phenomena of mass transition, which may be seen as having childlike qualities. Yet underneath all the froth and superficiality there may exist a current of authentic change for the better, which will come to the surface when the dust has settled and juvenile enthusiasms have worn themselves out. We really know too little about what might be termed true "social psychology" to form judgments concerning the brief period of observation before us. H.P.B.'s Messages to the American Theosophists, and other statements, scattered through the literature, in articles such as "The Fall of Ideals," "The Cycle Moveth," and "The Tidal Wave," would be useful to consider in connection with this question. Also Mr. Judge's article "On the Future: A Few Reflections."

As for change in ideas without a change in people—this is to be observed throughout history. Dogmatic religionists become dogmatic atheists; and dependent, clinging people who lack self-reliance go from one "leader" or "system" to another. The changes are in form only. The structure of motive has hardly changed at all, and the qualities of lower Manas rule in all such transitions. H.P.B.'s closing words in *The Key to Theosophy* could be considered a commentary on this tendency in human beings, and a line of direction concerning what is needed to make changes effective on all planes.

on the lookout

Unscientific Scientists

In "The Scientist as Shaman" (*Harper's,* March), Malachi Martin exposes the psychic vulnerability which leads both believers and the authorities they follow to accept as "certainties" matters which are far from demonstrated fact. He observes that this age-old susceptibility, once cultivated by organized religion, has been appropriated by some members of the scientific community. On the basis of perhaps well-deserved reputations as specialists in their own fields, these scientists are now claiming the whole area of metaphysical speculation as their domain, much as one of the Spanish conquistadores, landing on a Pacific beach, is said to have claimed all land beyond the shore, none of which he had explored. Mr. Martin's main criticism of these "scientians," as he calls them, is that they are not scientific.

The Final Reduction

In presenting mere assumptions as facts to the respectful layman, they have abandoned the scientific method. The author's comment is quite blunt:

> Scientism betrays man about whom it pontificates by threatening the integrity of his thought. It betrays science from which it springs by laying the *sine qua non* of any scientific process—conformity to objectively acquired data. It betrays the society of man that depends on science by offering a humanly inadequate panacea for society's ills. For scientians belie the very principle of scientific objectivity. They gloss over their illogic, presenting their own fantasies as fact, passing deceptively and self-forgivingly from a very conditional "would be" or "might have been" to a very dogmatic and assertive "was," "is," or "will be." If men were to accept as gospel the total scientian implication of hypothesis, prejudice, thoughtlessness, and wishful thinking then into the heart of human society they would have accepted a time bomb that surely would reduce society to the status of amino acids. The scientian dream of total integration with nature would be an accomplished fact.

Misuse of Reputation

Mr. Martin uses the geneticist, Jacques Monod, a Noble prize

winner, as an example of how this kind of deception obtains a foothold:

> As a scientian he does what he would never do, or be allowed to do, as a scientist: he lays aside the principles of scientific inquiry in order to erect an edifice of conjecture masquerading as fact and to propose a system of controls on man that would restrict the bounds of all future discovery. My profound uneasiness with Monod arises from the fact that he puts forward unscientific proposals as the results of his genuinely scientific achievements.

The writer illustrates his point with what Monod terms an "adequate assumption" that "the ultimate reason for all telenomic structures, and the structure and performance of all living beings, is enclosed in the sequences of globular proteins." But, having also stated that there is a "randomness" in these sequential structures, it becomes necessary to account for their regularity as well. This is accomplished by a second assumption, that of "invariance," which, in Monod's words, is "randomness caught on the wing, preserved, reproduced by the machinery of invariance, and thus converted into order, rule, necessity."

Candor Would Be Clearer

Mr. Martin sums up these verbal gymnastics:

> But for his enormous capability in his own field and his justifiably honored reputation for scientific achievement and but for the fact that the difficulty of his professional field leads minds occupied with less esoteric matters to cede points they think he must understand better—but for these things, it would be clear that he is saying what we all say so often about so many things: I don't know how it works, but it does.

On the basis of such spurious scientific practice, Mr. Martin sees the erection of an imposing structure of claims, while the "knowledge" which makes it all possible reposes only with a select class; this time it is scientists who are the priests. And yet, the fallacy of this reasoning is within the reach of the most uneducated, but independent, thinker.

Orwellian Nightmare

In discussing B. F. Skinner's utopian proposals in *Beyond Freedom and Dignity* Mr. Martin observes:

> Behavioristic studies and experiments, by Skinner and others, have not yet discovered and validated how the memory and imagination of man function, much less function "to save our-

selves." Without such knowledge, how can we plan even the simplest control over humans—let alone total environmental control? The came is true of our logical processes, of perception and creativity. We do not yet know how to trigger heroic behavior, self-sacrifice, denial of felt but hurtful desires; how to control the megalomania of an egotist, to stimulate the humor and wit of human conversation, the flow of ideas, respect for others, reverence for the aged and weak and young, patience under provocation, magnanimity in victory and success, or sharing with others.

It is all very well to teach a dog to lift its paws when it has a visceral change or to instruct a child to write "I am" instead of "I is." But there is no scientifically verified way in which all men can be conditioned by behavioristic principles to forsake war, love their neighbors, or build a Taj Mahal. If we are to establish total controls over all the population, who is to decide what is "good," "better," "best"? One shudders to think how such political *simplisme* and scientian presumption could lead to the horrors of an Orwellian 1984 or a Hitlerian *Herrenvolk*.

Nature Faking?

Another device of this sort is to change midway through some statement from a position that is conditional to one that assumes certainty. And a subtler kind of "fudging," Mr. Martin suggests, is found in the descriptions by Konrad Lorenz of the habits of wild animals in human terms:

The ordinary reader will not realize that what Lorenz has skillfully done is to describe the actions of animals using terms from the ethical and humanistic vocabulary. Some of Lorenz's fellow ethnologists have taken samples from his pages and described the behavior of his animals in quite a different way. Lorenz however, will succeed in impressing the layman with his knowledge of animals. "He must know what he is talking about" is the almost inevitable reaction of the respectful nonspecialist. When he has accomplished this, the rest is a foregone conclusion.

Lorenz proceeds to speak of man in the same way. If animals have a list of "Thou Shalts," is it surprising that we men have the same? And he produces, as an explanation of moral considerations in men, what must rank as the prime scientian statement of all this vast literature. Moral considerations and behavior are due to ritualization, according to Lorenz, and this ritualization "whose causation is so mysterious creates new instincts that dictate to the organisms their own 'Thou Shalt'."

What Remains Unknown

In concluding, Mr. Martin reviews what scientific investigation

has actually produced in the way of knowledge concerning those areas of man's life that reach beyond the physical senses. We find that, with a few notable exceptions, neither the accomplishment nor the outlook is very impressive:

> In any critical assessment of scientism, it is well to take an overall look at the field that scientism claims. Obviously, scientians are intensely interested in what was hitherto the domain of ethics, religion, and humanism: the behavior of men within those particular relationships on which societal living has been built. How far has solid scientific analysis gone in this field, scientism apart? The answer must be: not very far. In fact, we are still grappling with basic issues and receiving rather truistic conclusions. Researchers are conducting limited experiments into such things as the Good Samaritan instinct, obedience, criminal behavior, the genius scale, environmental life, warring tendencies, and attitudes toward death. But all this is in its infancy.

Reckless Assumptions

> One can only conclude that scientism is not scientific. Scientians proceed on the assumption that outside the realm of science there is nothing to discuss, and they tautologically presume that there is simply nothing beyond what can be observed by scientific means. This very assumption is unscientific, since by definition science cannot deal with any matter outside of scientific fact and scientific modes of knowing. Scientians then go even further and convert their basic assumptions into tenets rather than leaving them as hypotheses, and they draw vastly important conclusions without reference to the methods of the science whose data and dicta they invoke as witness. In drawing these conclusions, they abort the search for knowledge itself. The scientian's search becomes one for controls, and his writings come to resemble the proclamations of Dostoevsky's Grand Inquisitor.

These criticisms are not unlike those made so painstakingly by H. P. Blavatsky almost a century ago in her books and articles. She repeatedly called attention to the distinction to be made between genuine scientific endeavor and presumptions which reach far beyond the knowledge gained by either observation or experiment. And her criticisms of "scientism" were accompanied by the alternative approach of philosophy and metaphysics afforded in the propositions of the Wisdom-Religion.

Hatha Yoga in the Schools?

The wave of popular interest in Eastern religion and psychological practices, long evident in the exotic groups patronized by

ebellious youth, is now reaching the more conservative precincts f public education. In a current journal on education issued by a tate university, a writer recommends instruction of even elemenary school children in Hatha Yoga, explaining that this will help hem to gain "self-discipline":

> There appears to be no reason why Hatha Yoga should not be incorporated in the elementary grades. Meditation, however, is probably best postponed until adolescence. At this time physiological changes are contributing to the child's altered self-perception, and life-goals are beginning to take on serious importance. Meditation, then, should be introduced into the curriculum at the seventh or eighth grade level. Whether or not it will be effective at this level is an empirical question to be determined by the pilot program. Although we know that average college students are receptive to meditation, in the case of younger children we are simply making educated guesses on the basis of very limited observations.

Blind Leading the Blind?

In behalf of these proposals the writer says that while "there are few recognized techniques for training individuals in self-discipline," in the Western cultural context, there are nonetheless "certain techniques which have been developed elsewhere and are highly effective." It is suggested that the time has come to fit these methods to our needs, and pupils and teachers, it is said, ought to be able to measure their value. So the hungry quest for the new and the bizarre may lead to various psychological adventures, with children for subjects of the experiments. But what will qualify the teachers —to say nothing of the pupils—as judges of the merits of a pilot program in "meditation"? The ethical and moral foundation for all such practices is a primary consideration, since experiment of this sort could easily lead to mental disorders, especially in the case of the psychic and suggestible among the young.

Of a piece with developments of this sort in the schools is a catalog of tape recordings offered for sale to adults, headed *Instant Learning*. Among the choicer tapes is one which is said to instruct in "the secret of instant control," further identified as an "astounding method for putting someone in a trance—*without his knowledge*." "Psychism" does not seem a strong enough term to characterize tendencies of this sort. How many psychological disasters will be necessary in order to make it plain to empirically minded people that all these activities too easily turn into a wide highway to self-destruction?

A New View of Economics

Reviewing *The Cruel Choice: A New Concept in the Theory of Development* by Denis Goulet, in the March *Society* (formerly *Trans-action*), Dale L. Johnson gives appreciative attention to the author's contention that the plight of people living in a state of economic underdevelopment cannot be remedied by an infusion of money and technological know-how, administered according to conventional economic principles. Mr. Johnson says:

> Goulet rejects this kind of theory. He argues instead that development is a qualitative rather than a quantitative or technological process; that the old institutions of market economics are part of the problem, not the solution; that aid programs are based upon "structurally paternalistic relations" which serve the interests of donor nations, not the recipient countries.
>
> Nor does Goulet accept the conventional wisdom in the sociology of development which posits that underdevelopment has its roots in traditionalism. Traditional societies are said to be ascriptive; there is insufficient social mobility and an absence of certain values, such as thrift, work ethics and achievement orientation, associated with the Protestant ethic. In contrast to these ethnocentric doctrines, Goulet argues that traditional peoples have their own existence rationality and if they resist change, it is because such change may leave them more vulnerable to forces over which they have no control. People do not resist changes that preserve their identity and dignity and promote their capabilities to survive and their eventual progress.

Humanistic Development

Goulet sees the objective of economic development as meeting authentic human needs that he describes as "universal components of the good life." They include the provision of life-sustaining goods, a sense by the individual "that others are not using him as a tool to attain their own purposes," freedom from the deficiencies of outgrown structures, and freedom to realize human potential. Societies as much as individual men are living and changing organisms and should be continually transcending what they are and moving toward what they can become. To further this goal, economic development has to be guided by ethical principles consistent with it:

> For development strategies to be truly liberating certain ethical principles must guide strategy: the drive for material goods must be attuned to the achievement of the social good; conflict must be channeled so as to achieve a higher level of human solidarity; people must be able to participate in the decisions that affect their lives and futures.

It is clear that human dignity is a reality for this author, and that he believes that concrete measures can be devised which will support its growth. The book takes its title from the consideration that economic re-development is by no means a sure thing, but is full of risks. By pointing to the importance of those ethical principles which may lead to a fortunate outcome, the author believes the "cruelty" can be minimized.

Aggression not Innate

In spite of a greatly foreshortened estimate of the time involved in human history, and an over-simplified view of man's development from a "primitive" state, Dr. William Glasser offers (*Saturday Review* for Feb. 19) some interesting reflections on why men are less happy now than they were in earlier ages. He speculates on the alternations in human history between the need for cooperation and human solidarity in an abundant, if hostile, environment on the one hand, and the development of aggressive patterns of behavior for survival in a limited environment on the other, suggesting that men's minds may eventually be enslaved by those thought-habits when they become crystallized in institutions:

> The stresses and strains to which we have been subject in the civilized survival society have forced our conscious minds to choose behavior that conflicts with the cooperative behavioral tendencies built into the human nervous system during the two primitive societies that preceded civilization. The civilized survival society taught most men to suppress awareness of the suffering and deprivation existing all around them. The hostility and antagonism of the deprived helped the more privileged to rationalize this behavior. These defensive reactions have been so much a part of our civilized history that scholars studying the consequences have often, it seems, erroneously concluded that aggression and antagonism are innate human qualities while cooperation is not. Written history backs their theory. Human history seriously challenges it.

Basic Change in Progress

Dr. Glasser believes that the present period of turmoil is in fact a reassertion, at a different level, of the need for cooperation growing out of a period of relative affluence. The goal is becoming one of establishing an identity that bespeaks human worth rather than mere survival. He says:

> All the institutions of our society were, and for the most part still are, organized to preserve this 10,000-year-old distortion of our evolutionary heritage. The situation is heavily

> weighted against either understanding of, or preparation for, the new social stress that recently has caused most young people and a surprising number of older people to spend much of their time and energy pursuing a role independent of any specific security. Moving against the accumulated inertia of centuries, these people are trying to gain a successful identity—a pleasurable belief in themselves and in their own humanity and in the companionship of others in ways not necessarily related to security. Thus, in the past twenty or so years, a new society has begun to emerge. I call it the civilized identity society, because it is motivated by a respect for individual integrity. It cannot be passed off as a mere "generation gap," because the conflict involves a cleavage between contrasting cultures, not age groups.

Restoration of Cooperation

Dr. Glasser's thinking is obviously within the familiar "evolutionary" context, and his speculations imply that man is propelled from one stage to another by the exigencies of his environment. Yet his primary concern seems to be with the course of the non-materialistic relationships that humanity is capable of developing. He does not see primitive man as an aggressive being, his behavior the product of irrational drives, but little removed from the brute. What is lacking, however, is a rationale for the cyclic pattern of involution and evolution of the mind principle in man, and the long-range historical perspective this process necessarily requires. He says in conclusion:

> The new identity society is a regeneration of intelligent cooperation and involvement, reverting back hundreds of thousands of years to humanity.

For Scientists Only?

An article in the *Stanford Observer* for February, "Hypnosis: Its Place in a Science of Human Behavior," raises an additional issue, besides the usual one of the dangers attending the practice of this little-understood power. Written by Ernest R. and Josephine R. Hilgard, this article, long and ostensibly informative for the layman, glides nimbly past the knotty problems of continued suggestibility or hysteria which often follow in the wake of hypnotic trance, ignoring the fact that hypnotism was abandoned by Freud after thorough investigation, and that it was warned against by William James among many others. The explanation for this neglect is perhaps to be found in the authors' opinion that hypnosis should be used principally as a scientific technique of great value and interest to researchers, medical men and other specialists, and should be so

accepted by the public. With the approaching maturity of the psychological disciplines, hypnotism, they say, should cease to be the subject of controversy.

As in the advocacy of other psychic practices as "purely scientific" techniques, the profound effects on the subjects as living human beings receives only secondary consideration, if that. The Hilgards note that hypnotism has been the subject of recurring interest for centuries, beginning with Mesmer, whose researches in "animal magnetism" were summarily rejected by the savants of his time. But in spite of their claims of respectability in psychological experimentation for non-physical phenomena, they make no mention of its implications for man as a soul.

Reason for Complacency

An article on this subject by William Q. Judge suggests that this attitude is hardly a new development. He offers the following explanation:

> Professor James of Harvard has published his conclusion that experiments in hypnotism convince him, as they have convinced many, of the existence of the hidden self in man, while the French schools dispute whether it is all due to one personality mimicking many, or many personalities wrapped up in one person and showing one phase after another. Facts are recorded and wonderful things done, but no reasonable and final explanation has been made by the modern schools. Except here and there they, being ignorant of man's hidden real nature and powers, or denying the existence of such, see no cause for alarm in all these experiments and no danger to either society or the individual. As the true evolution of man's inner powers at the same rate and time concurrently with all other racial and planetary evolution is not admitted by these schools, they cannot perceive in the future any possibly devilish use of hypnotic powers. The Theosophist, however, suggests an explanation for the phenomena, points to similar occurrences through history, and intimates a danger to come if the thinking world does not realize our true nature as a being made of thought and consciousness, built in and on these, and destructible by them also so far as his personality is concerned. The danger is not in knowing these things and processes, but in the lack of morality and ethics in the use of them both now and in the future. ("Hypnotism," THEOSOPHY 47:492.)

How Hypnotism Works

Further on in this article, Mr. Judge details the pitfalls which surround this practice:

> The process of hypnotizing is as yet unknown in respect to what does happen to the molecules. We claim that those molecules are pressed from periphery to center instead of being expanded from the inside to the surface. This contraction is one of the symptoms of death, and therefore hypnotizing is a long step toward physical and moral death. The view expressed by Dr. Charcot that a subject is liable to fall under the influence at the hands of anyone should be admitted, as also that in the wake of the hypnotizer will be found a host of hysteriacs, and that it all should be regulated by law is unquestionable. I go still further and say that many persons are already in a half-hypnotized state, easily influenced by the unprincipled or the immoral; that the power to hypnotize and to be sensitive to it are both progressive states of our racial evolution; that it can and will be used for selfish, wicked, and degrading purposes unless the race, and especially the occidental portion of it, understands and practises true ethics based on the brotherhood of man. Ethics of the purest are found in the words of Jesus, but are universally negatived by Church, State, and individual.

The Only Safeguard

> The Theosophical doctrines of man and nature give a true and necessary basis and enforcement to ethics, devoid of favoritism or illogical schemes of eternal damnation. And only through those doctrines can the dangers of hypnotism be averted, since legislation, while affixing penalties, will not alter or curtail private acts of selfishness and greed.

It seems clear that by no means should hypnotism be relegated to the non-controversial security of the psychological laboratory; nor should the public be expected to take for granted that it is only a handy tool for probing by scientists into the unknown recesses of the mind. In fact, continued controversy would be one of the surest protections against the dogmatism to which science is itself so susceptible; for it may be that in this way the need for a much deeper comprehension of the subject may eventually be seen. Meanwhile, there has been far too little criticism of this practice in the public media.